



PUBLIC MATTER

1 STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
 OFFICE OF THE CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL
 2 RUSSELL G. WEINER, No. 94504
 INTERIM CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL
 3 PATSY J. COBB, No. 107793
 DEPUTY CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL
 4 NANCY J. WATSON, No. 89753
 ASSISTANT CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL
 5 GERI VON FREYMAN, NO. 97937
 SUPERVISING TRIAL COUNSEL
 6 MONIQUE T. MILLER, No. 212469
 DEPUTY TRIAL COUNSEL
 7 1149 South Hill Street
 Los Angeles, California 90015-2299
 8 Telephone: (213) 765-1486

FILED

MAR 08 2010

STATE BAR COURT
CLERK'S OFFICE
LOS ANGELES

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

STATE BAR COURT

HEARING DEPARTMENT - LOS ANGELES

In the Matter of:) Case Nos. 08-O-13195
) [08-O-13196; 08-O-13677; 08-O-14114;
 GERARD L. GARCIA-BARRON,) 08-O-14188; 08-O-14471; 08-O-14840;
 No. 159092,) 09-O-10444; 09-O-10487; 09-O-13648;
) 09-O-14124; 09-O-14346; 09-O-16753]
)
 A Member of the State Bar) NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES

NOTICE - FAILURE TO RESPOND!

IF YOU FAIL TO FILE AN ANSWER TO THIS NOTICE WITHIN THE TIME ALLOWED BY STATE BAR RULES, INCLUDING EXTENSIONS, OR IF YOU FAIL TO APPEAR AT THE STATE BAR COURT TRIAL, (1) YOUR DEFAULT SHALL BE ENTERED, (2) YOU SHALL BE ENROLLED AS AN INACTIVE MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR AND WILL NOT BE PERMITTED TO PRACTICE LAW UNLESS THE DEFAULT IS SET ASIDE ON MOTION TIMELY MADE UNDER THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE STATE BAR, (3) YOU SHALL NOT BE PERMITTED TO PARTICIPATE FURTHER IN THESE PROCEEDINGS UNLESS YOUR DEFAULT IS SET ASIDE, AND (4) YOU SHALL BE SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL DISCIPLINE.

STATE BAR RULES REQUIRE YOU TO FILE YOUR WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THIS NOTICE WITHIN TWENTY DAYS AFTER SERVICE.

IF YOUR DEFAULT IS ENTERED AND THE DISCIPLINE IMPOSED BY THE SUPREME COURT IN THIS PROCEEDING INCLUDES A PERIOD OF ACTUAL SUSPENSION, YOU WILL REMAIN SUSPENDED FROM THE PRACTICE OF LAW FOR AT LEAST THE PERIOD OF TIME SPECIFIED BY THE SUPREME COURT. IN ADDITION, THE ACTUAL

1 SUSPENSION WILL CONTINUE UNTIL YOU HAVE REQUESTED,
2 AND THE STATE BAR COURT HAS GRANTED, A MOTION FOR
3 TERMINATION OF THE ACTUAL SUSPENSION. AS A CONDITION
4 FOR TERMINATING THE ACTUAL SUSPENSION, THE STATE BAR
5 COURT MAY PLACE YOU ON PROBATION AND REQUIRE YOU TO
6 COMPLY WITH SUCH CONDITIONS OF PROBATION AS THE STATE
7 BAR COURT DEEMS APPROPRIATE. SEE RULE 205, RULES OF
8 PROCEDURE FOR STATE BAR COURT PROCEEDINGS.

9 The State Bar of California alleges:

10 JURISDICTION

11 1. GERARD L. GARCIA-BARRON ("Respondent") was admitted to the practice of
12 law in the State of California on June 8, 1992, was a member at all times pertinent to these
13 charges, and is currently a member of the State Bar of California.

14 COUNT ONE

15 Case No. 08-O-13195
16 Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A)
17 [Failure to Perform with Competence]

18 2. Respondent wilfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A), by
19 intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failing to perform legal services with competence, as
20 follows:

21 3. On or about January 29, 2007, Maria Aguirre ("Maria") employed Respondent to
22 represent her son Michael Aguirre ("Aguirre") in a criminal appeal. Respondent gave Maria a
23 copy of the attorney-client fee agreement that he signed and dated.

24 4. On or about February 5, 2007, Maria paid Respondent a \$10,000 retainer.
25 Respondent gave Maria a signed receipt for the \$10,000.

26 5. On or about March 24, 2007, Maria paid Respondent an additional \$15,000.
27 Respondent gave Maria a signed receipt for the \$15,000.

28 6. On or about July 9, 2007, Respondent filed a Notice of Appeal on behalf of Aguirre
in *People v. Aguirre*, California 2nd Appellate District Case No. B200904 (the "Aguirre appeal").

7. On or about October 30, 2007, the Court of Appeal sent Respondent a notice,
reminding him that the Aguirre appeal would be dismissed if the opening brief was not filed

1 within 15 days of the notice. Subsequent to October 2007, Respondent did not file an opening
2 brief on behalf of Aguirre.

3 8. On or about December 14, 2007, the Court of Appeal issued an order that the Aguirre
4 appeal be dismissed by default, advising that any party desiring reinstatement file a motion
5 within 15 days of the date of the order. Subsequent to December 14, 2007, Respondent did not
6 file a motion to reinstate the appeal on behalf of Aguirre.

7 9. By failing to file an opening brief on behalf of Aguirre and move to reinstate the
8 appeal after receiving the order of dismissal by default, Respondent intentionally, recklessly, or
9 repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence, in willful violation of Rules of
10 Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A).

11 COUNT TWO

12 Case No. 08-O-13195
13 Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-310(F)
[Accepting Fees from a Non-Client]

14 10. Respondent wilfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-310(F), by
15 accepting compensation for representing a client from one other than the client without
16 complying with the requirement that Respondent obtained the client's informed written consent,
17 as follows:

18 11. The allegations of paragraphs 3 through 5 are incorporated by reference.

19 12. Between in or about January and March 2007, when Respondent accepted the
20 payment of \$25,000 from Maria to represent her son in a criminal appeal, Respondent did not
21 obtain Aguirre's informed written consent to third party payment.

22 13. By failing to obtain Aguirre's informed consent to payment of legal fees by Aguirre's
23 mother, Respondent accepted compensation for representing a client from one other than the
24 client without complying with the requirement that Respondent obtained the client's informed
25 written consent, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-310(F).

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 business. The United States Postal Service did not return the investigator's letter as
2 undeliverable or for any other reason.

3 38. The investigator's letter requested that Respondent respond in writing to specified
4 allegations of misconduct being investigated by the State Bar in the Gomez complaint.

5 39. On or about September 11, 2008, Respondent called the investigator, requesting a
6 two-week extension to respond. On or about September 12, 2008, the investigator sent
7 Respondent a letter, granting an extension to respond by September 29, 2008.

8 40. On or about September 29, 2008, Respondent sent the investigator a written request
9 for a second extension until October 27, 2008. Respondent stated that he was "engaged in. . .
10 People v. Darrell Gray and Randle Hester . . . case number. . .06NF2588." On or about
11 September 29, 2008, the investigator sent Respondent a letter, granting an extension to respond
12 by October 27, 2008.

13 41. On or about October 29, 2008, the State Bar investigator sent Respondent a follow-up
14 letter regarding the Gomez complaint. Respondent did not respond to the October 29, 2008
15 letter.

16 42. On or about December 12, 2008, the State Bar investigator sent Respondent a follow-
17 up email regarding Respondent's lack of response. On or about December 15, 2008, Respondent
18 emailed the investigator back, stating that personal family problems and a difficult court
19 schedule delayed his ability to respond to the State Bar.

20 43. On or about January 7, 2009, the State Bar investigator sent Respondent a follow-up
21 email regarding Respondent's lack of response to the allegations of misconduct in the Gomez
22 complaint. Respondent failed to provide a response to the State Bar investigator's email.

23 44. Thereafter, Respondent did not respond to the investigator's letters or otherwise
24 communicate with the investigator.

25 45. By failing to provide the State Bar investigator with a response concerning the
26 allegations of misconduct in the Gomez complaint, Respondent failed to cooperate and
27 participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent, in wilful violation of
28 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i).

1 at his official State Bar membership records address. The United States Postal Service did not
2 return the investigator's letter as undeliverable or for any other reason.

3 68. The investigator's letter requested that Respondent respond by November 14, 2008 in
4 writing to specified allegations of misconduct being investigated by the State Bar in the Penate
5 complaint. Respondent failed to respond to the October 31, 2008 letter.

6 69. On or about November 25, 2008, the investigator sent Respondent a follow-up letter
7 requesting Respondent's answer by December 18, 2008. Respondent again failed to respond to
8 the investigator's letter of November 25, 2008.

9 70. On or about December 12, 2008, the investigator sent an email to Respondent's
10 blackberry. On or about December 15, 2008, Respondent emailed the investigator back, stating
11 that personal family problems and a difficult court schedule delayed his ability to respond to the
12 State Bar. Respondent also stated that he was finishing up a trial in Orange County Superior
13 Court and hoped to be done by December 18, 2008.

14 71. On or about January 7, 2009, the State Bar investigator sent Respondent a follow-up
15 email regarding Respondent's lack of response to the allegations of misconduct in the Penate
16 complaint. Respondent failed to provide a response to the State Bar investigator's email.

17 72. In or about February 2009, Penate requested and received a refund of \$1,500 from
18 Respondent.

19 73. Thereafter, Respondent did not respond to the investigator's letters or otherwise
20 communicate with the investigator.

21 74. By failing to provide the State Bar investigator with a response concerning the
22 allegations of misconduct in the Penate complaint, Respondent failed to cooperate and
23 participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent, in wilful violation of
24 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i).

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 83. By failing to refund any portion of the \$1,000 fees paid by Santiago, Respondent
2 failed to refund promptly any part of the unearned advanced fees, in wilful violation of Rules of
3 Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(2).

4 COUNT TWELVE

5 Case No. 08-O-14188
6 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i)
[Failure to Cooperate in State Bar Investigation]

7 84. Respondent wilfully violated Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i), by
8 failing to cooperate and participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent, as
9 follows:

10 85. The allegations of paragraphs 75 through 83 are incorporated by reference.

11 86. On or about September 30, 2008, Santiago filed a complaint (the "Santiago
12 complaint") with the State Bar.

13 87. On or about November 7, 2008, a State Bar investigator wrote to Respondent
14 regarding the Santiago complaint. The investigator's letter was properly mailed and addressed to
15 Respondent at his official State Bar membership records address. The United States Postal
16 Service did not return the investigator's letter as undeliverable or for any other reason.

17 88. The investigator's letter requested that Respondent respond by November 21, 2008 in
18 writing to specified allegations of misconduct being investigated by the State Bar in the Santiago
19 complaint. Respondent failed to respond to the November 7, 2008 letter.

20 89. On or about November 25, 2008, the investigator sent Respondent a follow-up letter
21 requesting Respondent's answer by December 10, 2008. Respondent again failed to respond to
22 the investigator's letter of November 25, 2008.

23 90. On or about December 12, 2008, the investigator sent an email to Respondent's
24 blackberry. On or about December 15, 2008, Respondent emailed the investigator back, stating
25 that he was involved in a trial in Santa Ana, and that personal family problems and a difficult
26 court schedule delayed his ability to respond to the State Bar.

27 ///

28 ///

1 Zendejas that the stipulation which she signed was silent on the issue of child support to
2 Zendejas' three children. Respondent did not obtain the informed consent of Zendejas who did
3 not understand what she was signing.

4 99. Between March and September 2008, Zendejas placed at least thirty calls to
5 Respondent's office, cell, and home numbers, inquiring into her dissolution matter and about a
6 conference-trial setting date of September 25, 2008. Respondent did not return the messages left
7 by Zendejas. On September 24, 2008, Zendejas succeeded in reaching Respondent who told her
8 over the phone that he would ask for a continuance because he was extremely busy.

9 100. In or about October 2008, frustrated in her attempts to reach Respondent and
10 concerned about her dissolution matter, Zendejas fired Respondent and retained new counsel,
11 attorney Annaluisa Padilla ("Padilla".)

12 101. On or about October 21, 2008, Padilla sent Respondent a letter of representation,
13 enclosing a substitution of attorney for Respondent's signature, and requesting Zendejas' client
14 file and a refund of unearned fees to Zendejas. Respondent did not respond to Padilla's letter.

15 102. On or about October 25, 2008, Padilla sent Respondent an email, again requesting
16 Zendejas' client file and a refund of unearned fees to Zendejas. Respondent did not respond to
17 Padilla's email.

18 103. By failing to explain to Zendejas the nature of the stipulation signed on March 28,
19 2008, agreeing to receiving no child support for her three children, Respondent intentionally,
20 recklessly, or repeatedly failing to perform legal services with competence, in willful violation of
21 Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A).

22 COUNT FOURTEEN

23 Case No. 08-O-14471
24 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m)
[Failure to Respond to Client Inquiries]

25 104. Respondent wilfully violated Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m), by
26 failing to respond promptly to reasonable status inquiries of a client, as follows:

27 105. The allegations of paragraphs 95 through 102 are incorporated by reference.

28 ///

1 Superior Court sent the State Bar a Discipline Referral Form, reporting Respondent in contempt
2 for his failure to appear, as ordered by the court.

3 130. By failing to appear at the OSC and to provide a response to the \$5,000 bench
4 warrant issued by the Superior Court, Respondent disobeyed or violated an order of the court
5 requiring him to do or forbear an act connected with or in the course of Respondent's profession
6 which he ought in good faith to do or forbear, in wilful violation of Business and Professions
7 Code, section 6103.

8 COUNT NINETEEN

9 Case No. 08-O-14840
10 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i)
[Failure to Cooperate in State Bar Investigation]

11 131. Respondent wilfully violated Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i), by
12 failing to cooperate and participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent, as
13 follows:

14 132. The allegations of paragraphs 123 through 130 are incorporated by reference.

15 133. On or about January 9 and January 27, 2009, a State Bar investigator wrote to
16 Respondent regarding the Superior Court complaint (the "SBI matter".) The investigator's
17 letters were properly mailed and addressed to Respondent at his official State Bar membership
18 records address. The United States Postal Service did not return the investigator's letters as
19 undeliverable or for any other reason.

20 134. The investigator's letters requested that Respondent respond in writing to
21 specified allegations of misconduct being investigated by the State Bar in the SBI matter.
22 Respondent failed to respond to the January 9 and January 27, 2009 letters.

23 135. Thereafter, Respondent did not respond to the investigator's letters or otherwise
24 communicate with the investigator.

25 136. By failing to provide the State Bar investigator with a response concerning the
26 allegations of misconduct in the SBI matter, Respondent failed to cooperate and participate in a
27 disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent, in wilful violation of Business and
28 Professions Code, section 6068(i).

1 COUNT TWENTY

2 Case No. 09-O-10444
3 Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A)
4 [Failure to Perform with Competence]

5 137. Respondent wilfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A), by
6 intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failing to perform legal services with competence, as
7 follows:

8 138. On or about July 7, 2008, Edwin Canales ("Canales") employed Respondent to
9 petition the court to increase his visitation with his children and reduce his child and spousal
10 support payments as ordered in Canales' dissolution matter, Los Angeles Superior Court Case
11 No. BD451023. At the time of employment, Canales gave Respondent his client file in Case No.
12 BD451023. Respondent gave Canales a copy of the attorney-client fee agreement that he signed
13 and dated.

14 139. On or about July 7, 2008, Canales paid Respondent a \$1,500 retainer.
15 Respondent gave Canales a signed receipt for the \$1,500.

16 140. Subsequent to July 2008, Respondent did not file any documents in Case No.
17 BD451023. Respondent failed to take any legal action on behalf of Canales.

18 141. By not taking any legal action on behalf of Canales, Respondent intentionally,
19 recklessly, or repeatedly failing to perform legal services with competence, in willful violation of
20 Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A).

21 COUNT TWENTY-ONE

22 Case No. 09-O-10444
23 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m)
24 [Failure to Respond to Client Inquiries]

25 142. Respondent wilfully violated Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m), by
26 failing to respond promptly to reasonable status inquiries of a client, as follows:

27 143. The allegations of paragraphs 138 through 140 are incorporated by reference.

28 144. Between in or about July 7 and November 28, 2008, Canales called Respondent's
office at least twenty-eight times, leaving messages inquiring about the modifications to prior
court orders in his dissolution matter. Respondent did not return any of Canales' messages.

1 170. Between in or about October and December 2008, when Respondent accepted the
2 payment of \$10,000 from Yuen to represent Watanabe in her felony criminal matter, Respondent
3 did not obtain Watanabe's informed written consent to third party payment.

4 171. By failing to obtain Watanabe's informed consent to payment of legal fees by
5 Watanabe's friend, Respondent accepted compensation for representing a client from one other
6 than the client without complying with the requirement that Respondent obtained the client's
7 informed written consent, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-310(F).

8 COUNT TWENTY-SEVEN

9 Case No. 09-O-10487
10 Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(2)
[Failure to Refund Unearned Fees]

11 172. Respondent wilfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(2), by
12 failing to refund promptly any part of a fee paid in advance that has not been earned, as follows:

13 173. The allegations of paragraphs 163 through 166 are incorporated by reference.

14 174. By failing to take any legal action on behalf of Watanabe in her felony criminal
15 matter, Respondent failed to earn the \$10,000 fee paid by Yuen.

16 175. By failing to respond to Yuen's request for a return of the \$10,000 unearned fees,
17 Respondent failed to refund promptly any part of the unearned advanced fees, in wilful violation
18 of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(2).

19 COUNT TWENTY-EIGHT

20 Case No. 09-O-10487
21 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i)
[Failure to Cooperate in State Bar Investigation]

22 176. Respondent wilfully violated Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i), by
23 failing to cooperate and participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent, as
24 follows:

25 177. The allegations of paragraphs 162 through 175 are incorporated by reference.

26 178. On or about January 8, 2009, Yuen filed a complaint with the State Bar (the
27 "Yuen complaint".)
28

1 179. On or about February 20 and March 11, 2009, a State Bar investigator wrote to
2 Respondent regarding the Yuen complaint. The investigator's letters were properly mailed and
3 addressed to Respondent at his official State Bar membership records address. The United States
4 Postal Service did not return the investigator's letters as undeliverable or for any other reason.

5 180. The investigator's letters requested that Respondent respond in writing to
6 specified allegations of misconduct being investigated by the State Bar in the Yuen complaint.
7 Respondent failed to respond to the February 20 and March 11, 2009 letters.

8 181. Thereafter, Respondent did not respond to the investigator's letters or otherwise
9 communicate with the investigator.

10 182. By failing to provide the State Bar investigator with a response concerning the
11 allegations of misconduct in the Yuen complaint, Respondent failed to cooperate and participate
12 in a disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent, in wilful violation of Business and
13 Professions Code, section 6068(i).

14 COUNT TWENTY-NINE

15 Case No. 09-O-13648
16 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i)
[Failure to Cooperate in State Bar Investigation]

17 183. Respondent wilfully violated Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i), by
18 failing to cooperate and participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent, as
19 follows:

20 184. On or about September 15, 2007, Patricia Sigala-Gallardo ("Gallardo") employed
21 Respondent to represent her in a criminal matter. Respondent gave Gallardo a copy of the
22 attorney-client fee agreement that he signed and dated. On the date of employment, Gallardo
23 paid Respondent a \$1,500 retainer.

24 185. On or about June 24, 2009, Gallardo filed a complaint with the State Bar (the
25 "Gallardo complaint"), alleging that Respondent failed to perform on her behalf and did not
26 return her calls.

27 186. On or about July 22 and August 11, 2009, a State Bar investigator wrote to
28 Respondent regarding the Gallardo complaint. The investigator's letters were properly mailed

1 and addressed to Respondent at his official State Bar membership records address. The United
2 States Postal Service did not return the investigator's letters as undeliverable or for any other
3 reason.

4 187. The investigator's letters requested that Respondent respond in writing to
5 specified allegations of misconduct being investigated by the State Bar in the Gallardo
6 complaint. Respondent failed to respond to the July 22 and August 11, 2009 letters.

7 188. Thereafter, Respondent did not respond to the investigator's letters or otherwise
8 communicate with the investigator.

9 189. By failing to provide the State Bar investigator with a response concerning the
10 allegations of misconduct in the Gallardo complaint, Respondent failed to cooperate and
11 participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent, in wilful violation of
12 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i).

13 COUNT THIRTY

14 Case No. 09-O-14124
15 Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A)
16 [Failure to Perform with Competence]

17 190. Respondent wilfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A), by
18 intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failing to perform legal services with competence, as
19 follows:

20 191. On or about January 5, 2009, Samuel Green ("Green") employed Respondent to
21 file a petition in Superior and Juvenile Court to expunge his criminal record. Respondent gave
22 Green a copy of the attorney-client agreement that he signed and dated.

23 192. On or about January 5, 2009, Green paid Respondent a \$750 retainer. Respondent
24 gave Green a signed receipt for the \$750.

25 193. On or about February 5, 2009, Green paid Respondent an additional \$750
26 retainer. Respondent gave Green a signed receipt for the additional \$750.

27 194. Thereafter, Respondent did not file any petition nor performed any legal services
28 on behalf of Green.

///

1 245. On or about July 13, 2009, Respondent appeared in court on Los Angeles
2 Superior Court Case No. SA068021, *People v. Matthews* (the “Matthews matter”), before Judge
3 Antonio Barreto (“Judge Barreto”). The Matthews matter was transferred to Judge James R.
4 Dabney (“Judge Dabney”) for jury trial on July 21, 2009.

5 246. On or about July 21, 2009, Respondent appeared before Judge Dabney in the
6 Matthew matter. Judge Dabney continued the Matthew matter to August 4, 2009, because
7 Respondent informed the court of a death of a family member and that funeral services would
8 take place “this week”.

9 247. On or about July 21, 2009, Judge Dabner informed Respondent that there was
10 another matter that Respondent “need[ed] to clear up before the next court date”. Judge Dabner
11 was referring to Respondent’s expired bar card.

12 248. On or about August 4, 2009, Respondent appeared before Judge Barreto in the
13 Matthews matter. Respondent informed Judge Barreto that his “father passed a couple of weeks
14 back.” Respondent’s father, Jose Garcia, was alive in July and August 2009.

15 249. On or about August 4, 2009, Judge Barreto asked Respondent if there were any
16 further issues regarding his expired Bar card. Respondent stated that there were none.

17 250. On or about August 13, 2009, an Order to Show Cause re: Contempt was held
18 before Judge Barretto. Respondent acknowledged that he knew that his license was suspended
19 on August 4, 2009, when he appeared before Judge Barretto.

20 251. On or about September 28, 2009, Judge Barretto found Respondent in contempt
21 of court. Respondent was sentenced to five days in county jail.

22 252. On or about July 13, July 21, and August 4, 2009, while Respondent was not
23 entitled to practice law, Respondent appeared as counsel of record for a criminal defendant.

24 253. By appearing as counsel of record for the defendant, Respondent held himself out
25 as entitled to practice law and actually practiced law when he was not entitled to do so, in wilful
26 violation of Business and Professions Code sections 6125 and 6126, and thereby failed to
27 support the laws of the State of California in violation of Business and Professions Code, section
28 6068(a).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ENROLLMENT WOULD BE IN ADDITION TO ANY DISCIPLINE RECOMMENDED BY THE COURT. SEE RULE 101(c), RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA.

NOTICE - COST ASSESSMENT!

IN THE EVENT THESE PROCEDURES RESULT IN PUBLIC DISCIPLINE, YOU MAY BE SUBJECT TO THE PAYMENT OF COSTS INCURRED BY THE STATE BAR IN THE INVESTIGATION, HEARING AND REVIEW OF THIS MATTER PURSUANT TO BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 6086.10. SEE RULE 280, RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA.

Respectfully submitted,

THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL

DATED: March 8, 2010

By: Monique T. Miller
MONIQUE T. MILLER
Deputy Trial Counsel

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY CERTIFIED MAIL

**CASE NUMBER: 08-O-13195 [08-O-13196; 08-O-13677; 08-O-14114; 08-O-14188;
08-O-14471; 08-O-14840; 09-O-10444; 09-O-10487; 09-O-13648;
09-O-14124; 09-O-14346; 09-O-16753]**

I, the undersigned, over the age of eighteen (18) years, whose business address and place of employment is the State Bar of California, 1149 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, California 90015, declare that I am not a party to the within action; that I am readily familiar with the State Bar of California's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service; that in the ordinary course of the State Bar of California's practice, correspondence collected and processed by the State Bar of California would be deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day; that I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date on the envelope or package is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing contained in the affidavit; and that in accordance with the practice of the State Bar of California for collection and processing of mail, I deposited or placed for collection and mailing in the City and County of Los Angeles, on the date shown below, a true copy of the within

NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES

in a sealed envelope placed for collection and mailing as certified mail, return receipt requested, Article No.: 7160 3901 9848 5950 2100, at Los Angeles, on the date shown below, addressed to:

**GERARD L. GARCIA-BARRON
2121 W. Imperial Hwy
La Habra, CA 90631**

in an inter-office mail facility regularly maintained by the State Bar of California addressed to:

N/A

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at Los Angeles, California, on the date shown below.

DATED: March 8, 2010

Signed: *Camelia I. Escobar*
Camelia I. Escobar
Declarant